

Existence of strong solutions for stochastic porous media equation under general monotonicity conditions

Viorel Barbu ^{*},

University Al. I. Cuza

and

Institute of Mathematics “Octav Mayer”, Iasi, Romania ,

Giuseppe Da Prato [†],

Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Italy

and

Michael Röckner [‡]

Faculty of Mathematics, University of Bielefeld, Germany

and

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Purdue University,
U. S. A.

February 2, 2008

Abstract. One proves existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to stochastic porous media equations under minimal monotonicity conditions on the nonlinearity. In particular, we do not assume continuity of the drift or any growth condition at infinity.

AMS subject Classification 2000: 76S05, 60H15.

^{*}Supported by the CEEEX Project 05 of Romanian Minister of Research.

[†]Supported by the research program “Equazioni di Kolmogorov” from the Italian “Ministero della Ricerca Scientifica e Tecnologica”

[‡]Supported by the SFB-701 and the BIBOS-Research Center.

Key words: stochastic porous media equation, Wiener process, convex functions, Itô's formula.

1 Introduction

This work is concerned with existence and uniqueness of solutions to stochastic porous media equations

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) - \Delta \Psi(X(t))dt = B(X(t))dW(t) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathcal{O} := Q_T, \\ \Psi(X(t)) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O} := \Sigma_T, \\ X(0) = x & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathcal{O}$ is an open, bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$, with smooth boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$, $W(t)$ is a cylindrical Wiener process on $L^2(\mathcal{O})$, $B : H \rightarrow L(L^2(\mathcal{O}), L^2(\mathcal{O}))$ is a Lipschitz continuous operator to be precised below and $H := H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$. The function $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (or more generally the multivalued function $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}}$) is a maximal monotone graph in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$.

Existence results for equation (1.1) were obtained in [8] (see also [3],[4]) in the special case $B = \sqrt{Q}$, with Q linear nonnegative, $\text{Tr } Q < +\infty$ and $\Psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ satifying the growth condition

$$k_3 + k_1|s|^{r-1} \leq \Psi'(s) \leq k_2(1 + |s|^{r-1}), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $k_1, k_2 > 0$, $k_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r > 1$.

Under these growth conditions on Ψ , equation (1.1) covers many important models of dynamics of an ideal gas in a porous medium (see e.g. [1]) but excludes, however, other significant physical models such as plasma fast diffusion ([5]) which arises for $\Psi(s) = \sqrt{s}$, phase transitions or dynamics of saturated underground water flows (Richard's equation). In the later case multivalued monotone graphs Ψ might appear (see [12]). Recently in [15] (see also [14]) the existence results of [8] were extended to the case of monotone nonlinearities Ψ such that $s \mapsto s\Psi(s)$ is (comparable to) a Δ_2 -regular Young function (cf. assumption (A1) in [15]) thus including the fast diffusion model. As a matter of fact, in the line of the classical work of N. Krylov and B. Rozovskii [10] the approach used in [15] is a variational one i.e. one considers the stochastic equation (1.1) in a duality setting induced by a functional triplet $V \subset H \subset V'$ and this requires to find appropriate spaces V and

H . This was done in [15] in an elaborate way even with Δ replaced by very general (not necessarily differential) operators L .

The method we use here is quite different and essentially an L^1 -approach relying on weak compactness techniques in $L^1(Q_T)$ via the Dunford-Pettis theorem which involve minimal growth assumptions on Ψ . Restricted to single valued continuous functions Ψ the main result, Theorem 2.2 below, gives existence and uniqueness of solutions only assuming that $\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi(s) = +\infty$, $\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \Psi(s) = -\infty$, Ψ monotonically increasing and

$$\limsup_{|s| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\int_0^{-s} \Psi(t) dt}{\int_0^s \Psi(t) dt} < +\infty. \quad (1.3)$$

We note that the assumptions on Ψ in [15]) imply our assumptions. In this sense, under assumption (H2) below in the noise, the results on this paper extend those in [15] in case $L = \Delta$ if $\mathcal{O}$ is bounded and if the coefficients do not depend on (t, ω) . The latter two were not assumed in [15]. On the other hand a growth condition on Ψ is imposed in [15] (cf. [15, Lemma 3.2]) which is not done here. Another main progress of this paper is that Ψ is no longer assumed to be continuous, it might be multivalued and with exponential growth to $\pm\infty$ (for instance of the form $\exp(a|x|^p)$). We note that (1.3) is not a growth condition at $+\infty$ but a kind of symmetry condition about the behaviour of Ψ at $\pm\infty$. If Ψ is a maximal monotone graph with potential j (i.e. $\Psi = \partial j$) then (1.3) takes the form (see Hypothesis (H3) below)

$$\limsup_{|s| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{j(-s)}{j(s)} < +\infty.$$

Anyway this condition is automatically satisfied for even monotonically increasing functions Ψ or e.g. if a condition of the form (1.2) is satisfied. We note, however, that because of our very general conditions on Ψ the solution of (1.1) will be pathwise only weakly continuous in H . It seems impossible to prove strong continuity.

1.1 Notations

$\mathcal{O}$ is a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$ with smooth boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$. We set

$$Q_T = (0, T) \times \mathcal{O}, \quad \Sigma_T = (0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O}.$$

Moreover $L^p(\mathcal{O})$, $L^p(Q_T)$, $p \geq 1$, are standard L^p -function spaces and $H_0^1(\mathcal{O})$, $H^k(\mathcal{O})$ are Sobolev spaces on $\mathcal{O}$. Denote by $H := H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ the dual of $H_0^1(\mathcal{O})$ with the norm and the scalar product

$$|u|_{-1} := (A^{-1}u, u)^{1/2}, \quad \langle u, v \rangle_{-1} = (A^{-1}u, v),$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the pairing between $H_0^1(\mathcal{O})$ and $H_0^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ which coincides with the scalar product of $L^2(\mathcal{O})$. We have denoted by A the Laplace operator with Dirichlet homogeneous boundary conditions, i.e.

$$Au = -\Delta u, \quad u \in D(A) = H^2(\mathcal{O}) \cap H_0^1(\mathcal{O}). \quad (1.4)$$

Given a Hilbert space U , the norm of U will be denoted by $|\cdot|_U$ and the scalar product by $(\cdot, \cdot)_U$. By $C([0, T]; U)$ we shall denote the space of U -valued continuous functions on $[0, T]$ and by $C^w([0, T]; U)$ the space of weakly continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to U .

Given two Hilbert spaces U and V we shall denote by $L(U, V)$ the space of linear continuous operators from U to V and by $L_{HS}(U, V)$ the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators $F : U \rightarrow V$ with the norm

$$\|F\|_{L_{HS}(U, V)} := \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |Fe_i|_V^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\{e_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis in U .

If $j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is a lower semicontinuous convex function we denote by $\partial j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ the subdifferential of j , i.e.

$$\partial j(y) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : j(y) \leq j(z) + \theta(y - z), \forall z \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

and by j^* the conjugate of j (the Legendre transform of j),

$$j^*(p) = \sup\{py - j(y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

We recall that $\partial j^* = (\partial j)^{-1}$ (see e.g. [2], [6]),

$$j(y) + j^*(p) = py \quad \text{if and only if } p \in \partial j(y) \quad (1.6)$$

and

$$j(u) + j^*(p) \geq pu \quad \text{for all } p, u \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.7)$$

Moreover $\Psi := \partial j$ is maximal monotone, i.e.

$$(y_1 - y_2)(p_1 - p_2) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } p_i \in \partial j(y_i), \quad i = 1, 2$$

and $R(1 + \partial j) = \mathbb{R}$.

Given a multivalued function $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ we shall denote by $D(\Phi) = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : \Phi(u) \neq \emptyset\}$ the domain of Φ and by $R(\Phi) = \{v : v \in \Phi(u), u \in D(\Phi)\}$ its range.

Given a maximal monotone graph $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ there is a unique lower semicontinuous convex function $j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ such that $\Psi := \partial j$. The function j is unique up to an additive constant and called the *potential* of Ψ .

For any maximal monotone graph Ψ and $\lambda > 0$ by

$$\Psi_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda} (1 - (1 + \lambda\Psi)^{-1}) \in \Psi(1 + \lambda\Psi)^{-1}$$

we denote the *Yosida* approximation of Ψ . Here 1 stands for the identity function. Ψ_λ is Lipschitzian and monotonically increasing.

2 The main result

2.1 Hypotheses

(H₁) $W(t)$ is a cylindrical Wiener process on $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ defined by

$$W(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k(t) e_k, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\{\beta_k\}$ is a sequence of mutually independent Brownian motions on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, with right continuous filtration and $\{e_k\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$. To be more specific $\{e_k\}$ will be chosen as the normalized sequence of eigenfunctions of the operator A , hence $e_k \in L^p(\mathcal{O})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}, p \geq 1$.

(H₂) B is Lipschitzian from $H = H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ to $L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), D(A^\gamma))$ where $\gamma > d/2$.

(H₃) $\Psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ is a maximal monotone graph on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 \in \Psi(0)$,

$$D(\Psi) = \mathbb{R}, \quad R(\Psi) = \mathbb{R} \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\limsup_{|s| \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{j(-s)}{j(s)} < +\infty. \quad (2.3)$$

Here $j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the potential of Ψ i.e. $\partial j = \Psi$, which under assumption (2.2) is a continuous convex function. Since $0 \in \Psi(0)$, by definition we have $j(0) = \inf j$. Hence subtracting $j(0)$ we can take j such that $j(0) = 0$ and $j \geq 0$, hence $j^* \geq j^*(0) = 0$. It should be recalled (see e.g. [2],[6]) that the condition $R(\Psi) = \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to

$$j(y) < \infty \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \lim_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{j(y)}{|y|} = +\infty \quad (2.4)$$

and that the condition $D(\Psi) = \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to

$$j^*(y) < \infty \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \lim_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{j^*(y)}{|y|} = +\infty \quad (2.5)$$

Hypothesis (H_3) automatically holds if Ψ is a monotonically increasing, continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying condition (1.3) and

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi(s) = +\infty, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \Psi(s) = -\infty.$$

In particular, it is satisfied by functions Ψ satisfying (1.2) for $r > 0$ or more generally by those satisfying assumption (A1) in [15].

We need some more notations. Given a Banach space Z we shall denote by

$$C_W([0, T]; Z) = C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; Z))$$

the space of all continuous adapted stochastic processes which are mean square continuous. The space

$$L_W^2([0, T]; Z) = L^2([0, T]; L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; Z))$$

is similarly defined (see e.g. [7], [9]).

Definition 2.1 *An adapted process $X \in C_W([0, T]; H) \cap L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$, such that $X \in C^w([0, T], H)$, $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., is said to be a strong solution to equation (1.1) if there exists a process $\eta \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$ such that*

$$\eta(t, \xi) \in \Psi(X(t, \xi)), \quad \text{a.e. } (t, \xi) \in Q_T, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.6)$$

$$\int_0^\bullet \eta(s)ds \in C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})), \quad (2.7)$$

$$X(t) - \Delta \int_0^t \eta(s)ds = x + \int_0^t B(X(s))dW(s), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.8)$$

$$j(X), j^*(\eta) \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega). \quad (2.9)$$

(Here $\int_0^t \eta(s)ds$ is initially defined as on $L^1(\mathcal{O})$ -valued Bochner integral). Of course, if Ψ is single valued (2.6)-(2.8) reduce to

$$\int_0^\bullet \Psi(X(s))ds \in C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})), \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$X(t) - \Delta \int_0^t \Psi(X(s))ds = x + \int_0^t B(X(s))dW(s), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.11)$$

We note that X as in Definition 2.1 is automatically predictable.

Theorem 2.2 below is the main result of this work.

Theorem 2.2 *Under Hypotheses (H_1) , (H_2) , (H_3) , for each $x \in H$ there is a unique strong solution $X = X(t, x)$ to equation (1.1). Moreover, the following estimate holds*

$$\mathbb{E}|X(t, x) - X(t, y)|_{-1}^2 \leq C|x - y|_{-1}^2, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (2.12)$$

where C is independent of $x, y \in H$.

Theorem 2.2 will be proved in section 4 via fixed point arguments. Previously, we shall establish in section 3 the existence of solutions for the equation

$$\begin{cases} dY(t) - \Delta \Psi(Y(t))dt = G(t)dW(t) & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \Psi(Y(t)) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ Y(0) = x & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

where $G : [0, T] \rightarrow L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), D(A^\gamma))$ is a predictable process such that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|G(t)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), D(A^\gamma))}^2 dt < +\infty \quad (2.14)$$

and $\gamma > d/2$. By GdW we mean of course

$$GdW = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Ge_k d\beta_k.$$

By a solution of (2.13) we shall mean an adapted process Y satisfying along with $\eta \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$ conditions (2.6)-(2.9) where $B(X)$ is replaced by G .

Theorem 2.3 *Under Hypotheses (H_1) , (H_3) , (2.14), for each $x \in H$ there is a unique strong solution $Y = Y_G(t, x)$ to equation (2.13) in the sense of Definition 2.1. Moreover, the following estimate holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|Y_{G_1}(t, x) - Y_{G_2}(t, y)|_{-1}^2 &\leq |x - y|_{-1}^2 \\ + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|G_1(s) - G_2(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 ds, &\text{ for all } t \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

for all $x, y \in H$ and G_1, G_2 satisfying (2.14).

Remark 2.4 It should be noted that assumption (H2) excludes the case of equation (1.1) with covariance operator B of the form $B(X) = X$ i.e. the case of multiplicative noise. However such an equation can be approximated taking $B(X) = X * \rho_\epsilon$ (ρ is a mollifier in $\mathcal{O}$) or $B(X) = (1 + \epsilon A)^{-\delta} X$, $\epsilon > 0$.

Remark 2.5 Assumption (H_3) for example allows monotonically increasing functions Ψ which are continuous from the right on $\mathbb{R}$ and have a finite number of jumps $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N$. However in this case one must fill the jumps by replacing the function Ψ by the maximal monotone (multivalued) graph $\tilde{\Psi}(r) = \Psi(r)$ for r different from r_i and $\tilde{\Psi}(r_i) = [\Psi(r_i) - \Psi(r_{i-1} - 0)]$. Such a situation might arise in modelling of underground water flows (see e.g. [12]). In this case Ψ is the diffusivity function and (1.1) reduces to Richard's equation. It must be also said that Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 have natural extensions to equations of the form

$$dX(t) - \Delta \Psi(X(t))dt + \Phi(X(t))dt = B(X(t))dW(t), \tag{2.16}$$

where Φ is a suitable monotonically increasing and continuous function (see [15]). Also as in [15] one might consider the case where $\Psi = \Psi(X, \omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega$,

but we do not go into details, here. We also note that assumption $D(\Psi) = \mathbb{R}$ in Hypothesis (H_3) excludes a situation of the following type

$$\Psi(s) = \begin{cases} \Psi_1(s) & \text{for } s < s_0, \Psi(s_0) = (0, +\infty), \\ = \emptyset & \text{for } s > s_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

where Ψ is a continuous monotonically increasing function such that $\Psi_1(-\infty) = -\infty$. In this case problem (1.1) reduces to a stochastic variational inequality and it is relevant in the description of saturation processes in infiltration. An analysis similar to that to be developed below shows that in this case in Definition 2.1 the solution is no more an L^1 -function but a bounded measure on Q_T . We expect to give details in a later paper.

Another situation of interest covered by our assumptions (see also [15]) is that of logarithmic diffusion equations arising in plasma physics see e.g. [13]. In this case $\Psi(s) = \log(\mu + |s|) \operatorname{sign}(s)$.

3 Proof of Theorem 2.3

For every $\lambda > 0$ consider the approximating equation

$$\begin{cases} dX_\lambda(t) - \Delta(\Psi_\lambda(X_\lambda(t)) + \lambda X_\lambda(t))dt = G(t)dW(t) & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathcal{O} := Q_T, \\ \Psi_\lambda(X_\lambda(t)) + \lambda X_\lambda(t) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ X_\lambda(0) = x & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

which has a unique solution $X_\lambda \in C_W([0, T]; H)$ such that

$$X_\lambda, \Psi_\lambda(X_\lambda) \in L^2_W(0, T; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})).$$

Indeed, setting $y_\lambda(t) = X_\lambda(t) - W_G(t)$ where $W_G(t) = \int_0^t G(s)dW(s)$, we may rewrite (3.1) as a random equation

$$\begin{cases} y'_\lambda(t) - \Delta\tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)) = 0 & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. in } Q_T, \\ \tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)) = 0 & \text{on } (0, T) \times \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ y_\lambda(0) = x & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(y) = \Psi_\lambda(y) + \lambda y$, $\lambda > 0$. Note that $\tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(0) = 0$.

For each $\omega \in \Omega$ the operator $\Gamma(t) : H_0^1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ defined by

$$\Gamma(t)y = -\Delta\tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(y + W_G(t)), \quad y \in H_0^1(\mathcal{O}),$$

is continuous, monotone and coercive, i.e.

$$(\Gamma(t)y, y) \geq \lambda |y + W_G(t)|_{H_0^1(\mathcal{O})}^2 - (\Gamma(t)y, W_G(t)) \geq \frac{\lambda}{2} |y|_{H_0^1(\mathcal{O})}^2 - C_\lambda |W_G(t)|_{H_0^1(\mathcal{O})}^2.$$

Then by classical existence theory for nonlinear equations (see e.g. [11]) equation (3.2) has a unique solution

$$y_\lambda \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{O})) \cap L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\mathcal{O}))$$

with $y'_\lambda \in L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathcal{O}))$. The function $X_\lambda(t) = y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)$ is of course an adapted process because the solution y_λ to equation (3.2) is a continuous function of W_G and so it satisfies the requested condition.

3.1 A-priori estimates

From now on we shall fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and work with the corresponding solution y_λ to (3.2). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + (\tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)), y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)) \\ &= (\tilde{\Psi}_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)), W_G(t)), \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + (\Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)), y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)) \\ &= -\lambda(y_\lambda(t), y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)) + (\Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)), W_G(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Now set $j_\lambda(u) = \int_0^u \Psi_\lambda(r) dr$ and denote by j_λ^* the conjugate of j_λ . By (1.6) we have

$$j_\lambda^*(\Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t))) + j_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)) = \Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t))(y_\lambda(t) + W_G(t)).$$

Substituting this identity into (3.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j_\lambda(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)) + j_\lambda^*(\Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)))) d\xi ds \\
&= \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)) W_G(s)) d\xi ds \\
&\quad - \lambda \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} y_\lambda(s) (y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)) d\xi ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Since j_λ is the Moreau approximation of j

$$j_\lambda(u) = \min \left\{ j(v) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} |u - v|^2 : v \in H \right\},$$

we have (recall that the minimum is attained at $v = (1 + \lambda\Psi)^{-1}u$)

$$j_\lambda(u) = j((1 + \lambda\Psi)^{-1}u) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} |u - (1 + \lambda\Psi)^{-1}u|^2, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.6}$$

We now set

$$z_\lambda = (1 + \lambda\Psi)^{-1}(y_\lambda + W_G), \quad \eta_\lambda = \Psi_\lambda(y_\lambda + W_G). \tag{3.7}$$

Then, using (3.6) and the fact that $j_\lambda^* \geq j^*$ for all $\lambda > 0$, we see by (3.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(z_\lambda(s)) + j^*(\eta_\lambda(s))) d\xi ds \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s) - z_\lambda(s))^2 d\xi ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} \eta_\lambda(s) W_G(s) d\xi ds - \lambda \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} y_\lambda(s) (y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)) d\xi ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

We now estimate the first integral from the right hand side of (3.8) as follows

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} \eta_\lambda(s) W_G(s) d\xi ds \right| \leq \delta \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\eta_\lambda(s)| d\xi ds, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\delta := \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |W_G(s)|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O})} < +\infty$. We note that by assumption (2.14) and since $\gamma > d/2$ it follows by Sobolev embedding that $W_G(\cdot)$ has continuous sample paths in $D(A^\gamma) \subset L^\infty(\mathcal{O})$ and so δ is indeed finite.

Substituting (3.9) in (3.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(z_\lambda(s)) + j^*(\eta_\lambda(s)) d\xi ds \\ & + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (y_\lambda(s) + W_G - z_\lambda(s))^2 d\xi ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \delta \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\eta_\lambda(s)| d\xi ds - \lambda \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} y_\lambda(s)(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)) d\xi ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$-y_\lambda(s)(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)) \leq -\frac{1}{2} |y_\lambda(s)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} W_G^2(s),$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(z_\lambda(s)) + j^*(\eta_\lambda(s)) d\xi ds + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |y_\lambda(s)|^2 d\xi ds \\ & + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s) - z_\lambda(s))^2 d\xi ds \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \delta \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\eta_\lambda(s)| d\xi ds + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} W_G^2(s) d\xi ds \right), \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, we recall that condition $D(\Psi) = \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent with

$$j^* < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{j^*(p)}{|p|} = +\infty. \tag{3.11}$$

So, there exists $N = N(\omega)$ such that

$$|\eta_\lambda(s)| > N \Rightarrow j^*(\eta_\lambda(s)) > 2C\delta |\eta_\lambda(s)|.$$

Consequently, for $C > |Q_T|$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |\eta_\lambda(s)| d\xi ds &= \int \int_{|\eta_\lambda(s)| > N} |\eta_\lambda(s)| d\xi ds + \int \int_{|\eta_\lambda(s)| \leq N} |\eta_\lambda(s)| d\xi ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2C\delta} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} j^*(\eta_\lambda(s)) d\xi ds + NC\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (3.10), since $j \geq 0$, we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} |y_\lambda(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(z_\lambda(s)) + j^*(\eta_\lambda(s))) d\xi ds \\ & + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (y_\lambda + W_G - z_\lambda)^2 d\xi ds \leq C_1(1 + |x|_{-1}^2), \quad t \in [0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

which implies

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(z_\lambda(s)) + j^*(\eta_\lambda(s))) d\xi ds \leq C_1(1 + |x|_{-1}^2), \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (y_\lambda + W_G - z_\lambda)^2 d\xi ds \leq 2\lambda C_1(1 + |x|_{-1}^2), \quad (3.14)$$

where C_1 is a suitable random constants.

3.2 Convergence for $\lambda \rightarrow 0$

Since (by (2.4) and (2.5))

$$\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} j(u)/|u| = \infty, \quad \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} j^*(u)/|u| = \infty, \quad (3.15)$$

we deduce from (3.13) that the sequences $\{z_\lambda\}$ and $\{\eta_\lambda\}$ are bounded and equi-integrable in $L^1(Q_T)$. Then by the Dunford-Pettis theorem the sequences $\{z_\lambda\}$ and $\{\eta_\lambda\}$ are weakly compact in $L^1(Q_T)$. Hence on a subsequence, again denoted by λ , we have

$$z_\lambda \rightarrow z, \quad \eta_\lambda \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{weakly in } L^1(Q_T) \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.16)$$

Moreover, by (3.12), (3.14) we see that $z = y + W_G$ where

$$y_\lambda \rightarrow y \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H) \text{ and weakly in } L^1(Q_T). \quad (3.17)$$

Note also that by (3.2) we have for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$y_\lambda(t) - \Delta \left(\int_0^t (\eta_\lambda(s) + \lambda(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s))) ds \right) = x \quad (3.18)$$

and so the sequence $\{\int_0^\bullet (\eta_\lambda(s) + \lambda y_\lambda(s))ds\}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1(\mathcal{O}))$. Hence, selecting a further subsequence if necessary (see (3.10)), we have

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\bullet (\eta_\lambda(s) + \lambda y_\lambda(s))ds = \int_0^\bullet \eta(s)ds \text{ weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})). \quad (3.19)$$

So, by (3.18) we find

$$y(t) + A \int_0^t \eta(s)ds = x \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.20)$$

Since

$$\int_0^\bullet \eta(s)ds \in C([0, T]; L^1(\mathcal{O})) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})),$$

$t \mapsto \int_0^t \eta(s)ds$ is weakly continuous in $H_0^1(\mathcal{O})$, hence so is $t \mapsto A \int_0^t \eta(s)ds$ in H . So, defining

$$\tilde{y}(t) := -A \int_0^t \eta(s)ds + x, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.21)$$

$\tilde{y}$ is an H -valued weakly continuous version of y . Furthermore, we claim that for $\lambda \rightarrow 0$

$$y_\lambda(t) \rightarrow \tilde{y}(t) \text{ weakly in } H, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Indeed, since $\eta_\lambda \rightarrow \eta$ weakly in $L^1(Q_T)$ and $\lambda(y_\lambda + W_G) \rightarrow 0$ weakly in $L^1(Q_T)$ (since it even converges strongly in $L^2(Q_T)$ to zero by (3.10)), it follows that for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$\int_0^t (\eta_\lambda(s) + \lambda(y_\lambda(s) + W_G(s)))ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \eta(s)ds \text{ weakly in } L^1(\mathcal{O}).$$

Hence by (3.18)) and the definition of $\tilde{y}$ we obtain that for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$(-\Delta)^{-1}y_\lambda(t) \rightarrow (-\Delta)^{-1}\tilde{y}(t) \text{ weakly in } L^1(\mathcal{O}).$$

Since $y_\lambda(t)$, $\lambda > 0$, are bounded in H by (3.12), the above immediately implies the claim.

From now on we always consider this particular version $\tilde{y}$ of y defined in (3.21)). For simplicity we denote it again by y ; so we have

$$y_\lambda(t) \rightarrow y(t) \text{ weakly in } H, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

We can also rewrite equation (3.21) as

$$y_t(t) - \Delta\eta(t) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(Q_T), \quad y(0) = x. \quad (3.22)$$

Now we are going to show that

$$\eta(t, \xi) \in \Psi(y(t, \xi) + W_G(t, \xi)) \quad \text{a.e. } (t, \xi) \in Q_T. \quad (3.23)$$

For this we shall need the following inequality

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{Q_T} y_\lambda \eta_\lambda d\xi dt \leq \int_{Q_T} y \eta d\xi dt. \quad (3.24)$$

To prove this we first recall equation (1.6) which yields

$$j_\lambda(y_\lambda + W_G) + j_\lambda^*(\eta_\lambda) = (y_\lambda + W_G)\eta_\lambda, \quad \text{a.e. in } Q_T,$$

and so by (3.6) and since $j_\lambda^* \geq j^*$, we have

$$j(y_\lambda + W_G) + j^*(\eta_\lambda) \leq (y_\lambda + W_G)\eta_\lambda \quad \text{a.e. in } Q_T,$$

which yields

$$\int_{Q_T} (j(y_\lambda + W_G) + j^*(\eta_\lambda)) d\xi dt \leq \int_{Q_T} (y_\lambda + W_G)\eta_\lambda d\xi dt.$$

Since the convex functional

$$(z, \zeta) \rightarrow \int_{Q_T} (j(z) + j^*(\zeta)) d\xi dt$$

is lower semicontinuous on $L^1(Q_T)$ (and consequently weakly lower semicontinuous on this space) we obtain that

$$\int_{Q_T} (j(y + W_G) + j^*(\eta)) d\xi dt \leq \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{Q_T} y_\lambda \eta_\lambda d\xi dt + \int_{Q_T} W_G \eta d\xi dt. \quad (3.25)$$

Furthermore, by (3.12) and again by the weak lower semicontinuity of convex integrals in $L^1(Q_T)$ it follows that

$$j(y + W_G), j^*(\eta) \in L^1(Q_T). \quad (3.26)$$

On the other hand, since $j(u) + j^*(p) \geq up$ for all $u, p \in \mathbb{R}$ (see (1.7)), we have

$$(W_G + y)\eta \leq j(y + W_G) + j^*(\eta) \quad \text{a. e. in } Q_T. \quad (3.27)$$

Moreover, by assumption (2.3) we see that for every $M > 0$ there exists $R = R(M) \geq 0$, such that

$$j(-y - W_G) \leq Mj(y + W_G) \quad \text{on } Q^R$$

where

$$Q^R = \{(t, \xi) \in Q_T : |y(t, \xi) + W_G(t, \xi)| \geq R\}.$$

Since $j(y + W_G) \in L^1(Q_T)$ we have, by continuity of j ,

$$j(-y - W_G) \leq h \quad \text{a. e. in } Q_T, \quad (3.28)$$

where $h \in L^1(Q_T)$. On the other hand, since j is bounded from below we have

$$j(-y - W_G) \in L^1(Q_T). \quad (3.29)$$

Noticing that by virtue of the same inequality (1.7) we have, besides (3.27), that

$$-(y + W_G)\eta \leq j(-y - W_G) + j^*(\eta) \quad \text{a. e. in } Q_T, \quad (3.30)$$

by (3.27) and (3.28) it follows that a. e. in Q_T we have

$$|(W_G + y)\eta| \leq \max\{j(y + W_G) + j^*(\eta), j(-y - W_G) + j^*(\eta)\} \in L^1(Q_T)$$

and therefore $y\eta \in L^1(Q_T)$ as claimed (recall that $W_G \in L^\infty(Q_T)$).

Now we come back to equation (3.4) which by integration yields

$$\frac{1}{2} (|y_\lambda(T)|_{-1}^2 - |x|_{-1}^2) + \int_{Q_T} y_\lambda \eta_\lambda d\xi dt + \lambda \int_{Q_T} y_\lambda (y_\lambda + W_G) d\xi dt = 0 \quad (3.31)$$

and taking into account that

$$y_\lambda(T) \rightarrow y(T) \quad \text{weakly in } H, \quad (3.32)$$

we have by (3.31) that

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \int_{Q_T} y_\lambda \eta_\lambda d\xi dt \leq -\frac{1}{2} (|y(T)|_{-1}^2 - |x|_{-1}^2). \quad (3.33)$$

In order to complete the proof one needs an integration by parts formula in equation (3.21) (or (3.22)) obtained multiplying the equation by y and integrating on Q_T . Formally this is possible because $y\eta \in L^1(Q_T)$ and $y(t) \in H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. But, in order to prove it rigorously, one must give a sense to $(y'(t), y(t))$. Lemma 3.1 below answers this question positively and by (3.33) also proves (3.24).

We first note that since j, j^* are nonnegative and convex and such that $j(0) = 0 = j^*(0)$, we have for all measurable $f : Q_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$j(f) \in L^1(Q_T) \Rightarrow j(\alpha f) \in L^1(Q_T)$$

and

$$j^*(f) \in L^1(Q_T) \Rightarrow j^*(\alpha f) \in L^1(Q_T).$$

Furthermore, as in the proof of (3.28) by (2.3) we obtain

$$j(f) \in L^1(Q_T) \Rightarrow j(-f) \in L^1(Q_T).$$

By (2.3) the latter is, however, also true for j^* , if $f \in L^1(Q_T)$ and α is small enough. Indeed by (2.3) there are $M, R > 0$ such that

$$j(-s) \leq Mj(s) \quad \text{if } |s| \geq R,$$

hence replacing s by $(-s)$

$$\frac{1}{M} j(s) \leq j(-s) \quad \text{if } |s| \geq R.$$

Now an elementary calculation implies that for all $p \in \mathbb{R}$

$$j^*(-p) \leq R|p| + \frac{1}{M} j^*(Mp).$$

So

$$j^*(-p/M) \leq \frac{R}{M} |p| + \frac{1}{M} j^*(p).$$

Hence for $\alpha := 1/M$ we have

$$0 \leq j^*(-\alpha f) \leq \frac{R}{M} |f| + \frac{1}{M} j^*(f) \in L^1(Q_T).$$

Therefore, y and η constructed above fulfill all conditions in the following lemma since $W_G \in L^\infty(Q_T)$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $y \in C^w([0, T]; H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})) \cap L^1(Q_T)$ and $\eta \in L^1(Q_T) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\mathcal{O}))$ satisfy*

$$y(t) + A \int_0^t \eta(s) ds = x. \quad (3.34)$$

Furthermore, assume that for some $\alpha > 0$, $j(\alpha y), j^(\alpha \eta) \in L^1(Q_T)$. Then $y\eta \in L^1(Q_T)$,*

$$\int_{Q_T} y\eta d\xi dt = -\frac{1}{2} (|y(T)|_{-1}^2 - |x|_{-1}^2). \quad (3.35)$$

and

$$Y_\varepsilon \Sigma_\varepsilon \rightarrow y\eta \quad \text{in } L^1(Q_T),$$

where $Y_\varepsilon, \Sigma_\varepsilon$ are defined in (3.36) below.

Proof. We set for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$Y_\varepsilon = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} y, \quad \Sigma_\varepsilon = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} \eta, \quad (3.36)$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $m > \max\{2, (d+2)/4\}$. Then

$$Y_\varepsilon \in C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O}) \cap H^{2m-1}(\mathcal{O})) \subset C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O}) \cap C(\overline{\mathcal{O}}))$$

and

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon \in L^1(0, T; W^{2,q}(\mathcal{O})), \quad 1 < q < \frac{d}{d-1}.$$

Hence $Y_\varepsilon \Sigma_\varepsilon \in L^1(Q_T)$ and for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Y_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow y(t) \quad \text{strongly in } H^{-1}(\mathcal{O}), \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \\ Y_\varepsilon \rightarrow y \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(Q_T) \\ \Sigma_\varepsilon \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(Q_T) \\ \int_0^t \Sigma_\varepsilon(s) ds \rightarrow \int_0^t \eta(s) ds \quad \text{strongly in } H_0^1(\mathcal{O}) \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.37)$$

We note here that the last fact follows because (3.34) implies that $\int_0^\bullet \eta(s) ds \in C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O}))$. We have also by (3.34)

$$Y_\varepsilon(t) + A \int_0^t \Sigma_\varepsilon(s) ds = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} x, \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

which implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} Y_\varepsilon(t) + A\Sigma_\varepsilon(t) = 0$$

and, taking inner product in $H^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ with $Y_\varepsilon(t)$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} |Y_\varepsilon(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_{\mathcal{O}} \Sigma_\varepsilon(t) Y_\varepsilon(t) d\xi = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T].$$

Hence

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{Q_T} \Sigma_\varepsilon(t) Y_\varepsilon(t) d\xi dt = -\frac{1}{2} (|y(T)|_{-1}^2 - |x|_{-1}^2) \quad (3.38)$$

and by (3.37) we may assume that for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$Y_\varepsilon \rightarrow y, \quad \Sigma_\varepsilon \rightarrow \eta \quad \text{a. e. in } Q_T. \quad (3.39)$$

Moreover by (1.7) we have

$$\alpha^2 \Sigma_\varepsilon Y_\varepsilon \leq j(\alpha Y_\varepsilon) + j^*(\alpha \Sigma_\varepsilon), \quad -\alpha^2 \Sigma_\varepsilon Y_\varepsilon \leq j(-\alpha Y_\varepsilon) + j^*(\alpha \Sigma_\varepsilon) \quad \text{a. e. in } Q_T. \quad (3.40)$$

Now we claim that for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$j(\alpha Y_\varepsilon) \rightarrow j(\alpha y), \quad j^*(\alpha \Sigma_\varepsilon) \rightarrow j^*(\alpha \eta), \quad j(-\alpha Y_\varepsilon) \rightarrow j(-\alpha y) \quad \text{in } L^1(Q_T). \quad (3.41)$$

By (3.39) these convergences hold a.e. in Q_T . So, in order to prove (3.41) it suffices to show that $\{j(\alpha Y_\varepsilon)\}, \{j^*(\alpha \Sigma_\varepsilon)\}, \{j(-\alpha Y_\varepsilon)\}$ are equi-integrable on Q_T and so that they are weakly compact in $L^1(Q_T)$. To this end let $y \in L^1(\mathcal{O})$ and let $Y_\varepsilon := (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-1}y$, i.e. y is the solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} Y_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \Delta Y_\varepsilon = y, & \text{in } \mathcal{O}, \\ Y_\varepsilon = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (3.42)$$

It may be represented as

$$Y_\varepsilon(\xi) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_1) y(\xi_1) d\xi_1, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{O}, \quad (3.43)$$

where G is the associated Green function. It is well known that $\int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_1) d\xi_1$ is the solution to (3.42) with $y = 1$ so that by the maximum principle we have $0 < \int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_1) d\xi_1 \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{O}$.

We may rewrite Y_ε as

$$Y_\varepsilon(\xi) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_2) d\xi_2 \int_{\mathcal{O}} \tilde{G}(\xi, \xi_1) y(\xi_1) d\xi_1, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{O},$$

where

$$\tilde{G}(\xi, \xi_1) = \frac{G(\xi, \xi_1)}{\int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_2) d\xi_2}$$

and so $\int_{\mathcal{O}} \tilde{G}(\xi, \xi_1) d\xi_1 = 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{O}$.

Then, if $j(y) \in L^1(\mathcal{O})$ by Jensen's inequality, since $j(0) = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} j(Y_\varepsilon(\xi)) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_2) d\xi_2 \int_{\mathcal{O}} \tilde{G}(\xi, \xi_1) j(y(\xi_1)) d\xi_1 \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} G(\xi, \xi_1) j(y(\xi_1)) d\xi_1, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{O}. \end{aligned}$$

So, we proved that for any $y \in L^1(\mathcal{O})$ with $j(y) \in L^1(\mathcal{O})$

$$j((1 + \varepsilon A)^{-1} y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-1} j(y).$$

Iterating and using the fact that $(1 + \varepsilon A)^{-1}$ preserves positivity we get for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$j((1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} j(y), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathcal{O}. \quad (3.44)$$

Now let y be as in the assertion of the lemma and Y_ε as in (3.36). Integrating over Q_T , since $(1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m}$ is a contraction on $L^1(\mathcal{O})$, (3.44) applied to αy implies

$$\int_{Q_T} j(\alpha Y_\varepsilon(\xi, t)) d\xi dt \leq \int_{Q_T} j(\alpha y(\xi_2, t)) d\xi_2 dt.$$

Taking into account that $j(\alpha y) \in L^1(Q_T)$ we infer that $\{j(\alpha Y_\varepsilon)\}$ is equi-integrable on Q_T . The same argument applies to $\{j^*(\alpha \Sigma_\varepsilon)\}$, $\{j(-\alpha Y_\varepsilon)\}$.

Then (3.40) implies that sequence $\{\Sigma_\varepsilon Y_\varepsilon\}$ is equi-integrable on Q_T and consequently by the Dunford-Pettis theorem, weakly compact in $L^1(Q_T)$. Since $\{\Sigma_\varepsilon Y_\varepsilon\}$ is a.e. convergent to $y\eta$ we infer that for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\Sigma_\varepsilon Y_\varepsilon \rightarrow y\eta \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(Q_T), \quad (3.45)$$

which combined with (3.38) implies (3.35) as desired. $\square$

We now prove (3.23). We have

$$j(z_\lambda) - j(u) \leq \eta_\lambda(z_\lambda - u), \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{a.e. in } Q_T.$$

Integrating over Q_T yields

$$\int_{Q_T} j(z_\lambda) d\xi dt \leq \int_{Q_T} j(u) d\xi dt + \int_{Q_T} \eta_\lambda(z_\lambda - u) d\xi dt, \quad \forall u \in L^\infty(Q_T).$$

Note that, by the definition of Ψ_λ we have

$$z_\lambda = -\lambda\eta_\lambda + y_\lambda + W_G.$$

Therefore, since $z = y + W_G$, by (3.24) and Fatou's lemma we can let $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ to obtain

$$\int_{Q_T} j(z) d\xi dt - \int_{Q_T} j(u) d\xi dt \leq \int_{Q_T} \eta(z - u) d\xi dt, \quad \forall u \in L^\infty(Q_T).$$

Now by Lusin's theorem for each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a compact subset $Q_\epsilon \subset Q_T$ such that $(d\xi \otimes dt)(Q_T \setminus Q_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon$ and y, η are continuous on Q_ϵ . Let (t_0, x_0) be a Lebesgue point for y, η and $y\eta$ and let B_r be the ball of center (t_0, x_0) and radius r . We take

$$u(t, \xi) = \begin{cases} z(t, \xi), & \text{if } (t, \xi) \in Q_\epsilon \cap B_r^c \\ v, & \text{if } (t, \xi) \in (Q_\epsilon \cap B_r) \cup (Q_T \setminus Q_\epsilon). \end{cases}$$

Here v is arbitrary in $\mathbb{R}$. Since u is bounded we can substitute into the above inequality to get

$$\int_{B_r \cap Q_\epsilon} (j(z) - j(v) - \eta(z - v)) d\xi dt \leq \int_{Q_T \setminus Q_\epsilon} (\eta(z - v) + j(v) - j(z)) d\xi dt.$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain that

$$\int_{B_r} (j(z) - j(v) - \eta(z - v)) d\xi dt \leq 0, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad r > 0.$$

This yields

$$j(z(t_0, x_0)) \leq j(v) + \eta(t_0, x_0)(z(t_0, x_0) - v), \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}.$$

and therefore $\eta(t_0, x_0) \in \partial j(z(t_0, x_0)) = \Psi(z(t_0, x_0))$. Since almost all points of Q_T are Lebesgue points we get (3.23) as claimed.

Proof of Theorem 2.3 (Continued). Let us first summarize what we have proved for the pair $(y, \eta) \in L^1(Q_T) \times L^1(Q_T)$. We have

$$y \in C^w([0, T]; H), \quad \int_0^\bullet \eta(s) ds \in C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})),$$

$$\eta(t, \xi) \in \Psi(y(t, \xi)) \quad \text{for a.e. } (t, \xi) \in Q^T,$$

$$y(t) + A \int_0^t \eta(s) ds = x, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

$$j(\alpha y), j^*(\alpha y) \in L^1(Q_T) \quad \text{for some } \alpha \in (0, 1].$$

We claim that (y, η) is the only such pair. Indeed, if $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{\eta})$ is another then

$$j\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}(y - \tilde{y})\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} j(\alpha y) + \frac{1}{2} j(-\alpha \tilde{y})$$

and

$$j^*\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}(y - \tilde{y})\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} j^*(\alpha y) + \frac{1}{2} j^*(-\alpha \tilde{y}).$$

But as we have explained before Lemma 3.1 the right hand sides are in $L^1(Q_T)$. Hence $y - \tilde{y}$, $\eta - \tilde{\eta}$ fulfill all conditions of Lemma 3.1 and adopting the notation from there we have for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{Y}_\varepsilon(t) &= \Delta \int_0^t (\Sigma_\varepsilon(s) - \tilde{\Sigma}_\varepsilon(s)) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \Delta(\Sigma_\varepsilon(s) - \tilde{\Sigma}_\varepsilon(s)) ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating and subsequently taking the inner product in H with $Y_\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{Y}_\varepsilon(t)$ and integrating again we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left| (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} (Y_\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{Y}_\varepsilon(t)) \right|_{-1}^2 &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (Y_\varepsilon(s) - \tilde{Y}_\varepsilon(s)) (\Sigma_\varepsilon(s) - \tilde{\Sigma}_\varepsilon(s)) d\xi ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} ((1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} (y(s) - \tilde{y}(s)) (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} (\eta(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s))) d\xi ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and applying Lemma 3.1 we obtain that for $t \in [0, T]$

$$\frac{1}{2} |y(t) - \tilde{y}(t)|_{-1}^2 = \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (y(s) - \tilde{y}(s))(\eta(s) - \tilde{\eta}(s)) d\xi ds \leq 0$$

by the monotonicity of Ψ .

Now let us consider the ω -dependence of y and η . By (3.21), (3.23) we know that $y = y(t, \xi, \omega)$ is the solution to equation

$$\begin{cases} y'(t) - \Delta \Psi(y(t) + W_G(t)(\omega)) = 0 & \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \\ y(0) = x \end{cases} \quad (3.46)$$

and as seen earlier for $\eta = \eta(t, \xi, \omega)$ as in (3.16)

$$\begin{aligned} y &\in C^w([0, T]; H) \cap L^1(Q_T), \quad \eta \in L^1(Q_T) \\ \int_0^\bullet \eta(s) ds &\in C^w([0, T]; H_0^1(\mathcal{O})), \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

and

$$\eta(t, \xi, \omega) \in \Psi(y(t, \xi, \omega)) + W_G(t, \xi, \omega) \quad \text{a.e. } (t, \xi, \omega) \in Q_T \times \Omega. \quad (3.48)$$

By the above uniqueness of (y, η) , it follows that for any sequence $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} y_\lambda(t) &\rightarrow y(t) \quad \text{weakly in } H = H^{-1}(\mathcal{O}), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ y_\lambda &\rightarrow y \quad \text{weakly in } L^1(Q_T), \\ \int_0^t \eta_\lambda(s) ds &\rightarrow \int_0^t \eta(s) ds \quad \text{weakly in } L^1(\mathcal{O}), \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \\ &\text{and weakly in } H_0^1(\mathcal{O}), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \\ \eta_\lambda &\rightarrow \eta \quad \text{weakly in } L^1(Q_T). \end{aligned}$$

Since y and η are hence strong $L^1(Q_T)$ -limits of a sequence of convex combinations of y_λ , η_λ respectively, and y_λ and η_λ are predictable processes, it follows that so are y and η . In particular, this means that $Y(t) = y(t) + W_G(t)$ is an

H -valued weakly continuous adapted process and that the following equation is satisfied

$$Y(t) - \Delta \int_0^t \eta(s) ds = x + \int_0^t G(s) dW(s), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.49)$$

Equivalently

$$\begin{cases} dY(t) - \Delta \Psi(Y(t)) dt = G(t) dW(t), \\ Y(0) = x. \end{cases} \quad (3.50)$$

In order to prove that Y is a solution of (3.50) in the sense of Definition 2.1 with $G(t)$ replacing $B(X(t))$ and to prove uniqueness and some energy estimates for solutions to equation (3.50) we need an Itô's formula type result. As in the case of Lemma 3.1 the difficulty is that the integral

$$\int_{Q_T} \Psi(Y) Y d\xi dt$$

might be (in general) not well defined taking into account that $\Psi(Y), Y \in L^1(Q_T)$ only. We, however, have

Lemma 3.2 *Let Y as above. Then the following equality holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |Y(t)|_{-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 - \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} \eta(s) Y(s) d\xi ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \langle Y(s), G(s) dW(s) \rangle_{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|G(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (3.51)$$

Furthermore, $Y \in C_W([0, T]; H) \cap L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$, and $\eta \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$ and all conditions (2.6)-(2.9) are satisfied.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 we have that $Y\eta \in L^1(Q_T)$. Next we introduce the sequences (see the proof of Lemma 3.1) for $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$Y_\varepsilon = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} Y, \quad \Sigma_\varepsilon = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} \eta.$$

For large enough m we can apply Itô's formula to the problem

$$\begin{cases} dY_\varepsilon(t) + A\Sigma_\varepsilon(t) = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} G dW(t) \\ Y_\varepsilon(0) = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} x = x_\varepsilon. \end{cases} \quad (3.52)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |Y_\varepsilon(t)|_{-1}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} |x_\varepsilon|_{-1}^2 - \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} \Sigma_\varepsilon(s) Y_\varepsilon(s) d\xi ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \langle Y_\varepsilon(s), G_\varepsilon(s) dW(s) \rangle_{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|G_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

where $G_\varepsilon = (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-m} G$. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (since $W_G \in L^\infty(Q_T)$) we get by (3.45)

$$\int_{Q_T} Y_\varepsilon \Sigma_\varepsilon d\xi ds \rightarrow \int_{Q_T} Y \eta d\xi ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Furthermore

$$Y_\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow Y(t) \quad \text{strongly in } H^{-1}(\mathcal{O}), \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

which by virtue of (3.53) yields (3.51), if we can show that for $t \in [0, T]$

$$\mathbb{P} - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \langle Y_\varepsilon(s), G_\varepsilon(s) dW(s) \rangle = \int_0^t \langle Y(s), G(s) dW(s) \rangle. \quad (3.54)$$

We shall even show that this convergence in probability is locally uniform in t . We have by a standard consequence of the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality for $p = 1$ (see e.g. [14, Corollary D-0.2]) that for $\bar{Y}_\varepsilon := (1 + \varepsilon A)^{-2m} Y$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \langle Y(s), G(s) dW(s) \rangle - \int_0^t \langle Y_\varepsilon(s), G_\varepsilon(s) dW(s) \rangle \right| \geq \delta_1 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{3\delta_2}{\delta_1} + \mathbb{P} \left[\int_0^T \|G(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 |Y(s) - \bar{Y}_\varepsilon(s)|_{-1}^2 ds \geq \delta_2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

Since $Y \in C^w([0, T]; H)$, $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and $(1 + \varepsilon A)^{-1}$ is a contraction on H we have

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |Y(s) - \bar{Y}_\varepsilon(s)|_{-1} \leq 2 \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |Y(s)|_{-1}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence by (2.14) the second term on the right hand side of (3.55) converges to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Taking subsequently $\delta_2 \rightarrow 0$, (3.55) implies (3.54). We emphasize that, since the left hand side of (3.51) is not continuous $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

(though all terms on the right hand side are), the $\mathbb{P}$ -zero set of $\omega \in \Omega$ for which (3.51) does not hold might depend on t .

Next we would like to take expectation in (3.51). Note that because $|Y(t)|_{-1}^2$ is not $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. continuous in t we cannot use stopping times to argue that (3.51) holds with expectation taken for every summand and the local martingale term dropped. We need a more delicate argument here. To this end first note that by (3.48) and (1.6) we have

$$\eta(s)Y(s) = j(Y(s)) + j^*(\eta(s)) \geq 0, \quad (3.56)$$

hence (3.51) implies that for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$|Y(t)|_{-1}^2 \leq |x|_{-1}^2 + N_t + \int_0^t \|G(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (3.57)$$

where

$$N_t := \int_0^t \langle Y(s), G(s) dW(s) \rangle_{-1}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

is a continuous local martingale such that

$$\langle N \rangle_t = 2 \int_0^t |G^*(s)Y(s)|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})}^2 ds, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $G^*(s)$ is the adjoint of $G(s) : L^2(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow H$. We shall prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |N_t| \right] < +\infty. \quad (3.58)$$

By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality for $p = 1$ applied to the stopping times

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_N &:= \inf\{t \geq 0 : |N_t| \geq N\} \wedge T, \quad N \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_N]} |N_t| \right] &\leq 3E \left[\sup_{s \in [0, \tau_N]} |Y(s)|_{-1} \left(4 \int_0^{\tau_N} \|G(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq 6C \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, \tau_N]} |Y(s)|_{-1}^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

where

$$C := \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \|G(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O});H)}^2 ds \right] \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Since $Y \in C^w([0, T]; H)$, we know that $s \mapsto |Y(s)|_{-1}^2$ is lower semicontinuous. Therefore by (3.57)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \in [0, \tau_N]} |Y(s)|_{-1}^2 &= \sup_{s \in [0, \tau_N] \cap \mathbb{Q}} |Y(s)|_{-1}^2 \leq |x|_{-1}^2 + \sup_{s \in [0, \tau_N]} |N_s| \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \|G(s)\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O});H)}^2 ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

So (3.59) implies that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_N]} |N_t| \right] \right)^2 \leq 36C^2 \left[|x|_{-1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, \tau_N]} |N_s| \right] + C^2 \right],$$

which entails that

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_N]} |N_t| \right] < \infty.$$

By monotone convergence this implies (3.58), since N_t has continuous sample paths and $\tau_N \uparrow T$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Now (3.57) implies that also

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y(t)|_{-1}^2 \right] < \infty. \quad (3.60)$$

By (3.58), (3.56) and (3.51) it follows that

$$\eta Y \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega). \quad (3.61)$$

Hence by (3.56)

$$j(Y), j^*(\eta) \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$$

and therefore

$$Y, \eta \in L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega).$$

Taking expectation in (3.51) we see that $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}[|Y(t)|_{-1}^2]$ is continuous. Since $Y \in C^w([0, T]; H)$, $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., (3.60) then also implies $Y \in C_W([0, T]; H)$. This in turn together with (3.49) implies that also (2.7) holds. $\square$

Now we come back to the proof of Theorem 2.3 noticing that Lemma 3.2 also implies the uniqueness of the solution Y and estimate (2.15). This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.3. $\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Consider the space

$$\mathcal{K} = \left\{ X \in C_W([0, T]; H) \cap L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega) : X \text{ predictable}, \right. \\ \left. \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[e^{-2\alpha t} |X(t)|_{-1}^2] \leq M_1^2, \mathbb{E} \int_{Q_T} j(X(s)) d\xi ds \leq M_2 \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $M_1 > 0$ and $M_2 > 0$ will be specified later.

The space $\mathcal{K}$ is endowed with the norm

$$\|X\|_\alpha = \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[e^{-2\alpha t} |X(t)|_{-1}^2] \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{K}$ is closed in the norm $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$. Indeed, if $X_n \rightarrow X$ in $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ then since

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{Q_T} j(X_n(s)) d\xi ds \leq M_2, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

(3.15) implies that

$$X_n \rightarrow X, \quad \text{in } L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$$

and by Fatou's Lemma we get

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{Q_T} j(X(s)) d\xi ds \leq M_2.$$

as claimed. Now consider the mapping $\Gamma : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ defined by

$$Y = \Gamma(X), \quad (4.2)$$

where $Y \in C_W([0, T]; H) \cap L^1((0, T) \times \mathcal{O} \times \Omega)$ is the solution in the sense of Definition 2.1 of the problem

$$\begin{cases} dY(t) - \Delta \Psi(Y(t)) dt = B(X(t)) dW(t) & \text{in } Q_T, \\ \Psi(Y(t)) = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ Y(0) = x & \text{in } \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

We shall prove that for α, M_1, M_2 suitably chosen, Γ maps $\mathcal{K}$ into itself and it is a contraction in the norm $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$.

By (4.3), (3.51) and (1.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} |Y(t)|_{-1}^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(Y(s)) + j^*(\eta(s))) d\xi ds \\
&= \int_0^t \langle Y(s), B(X(s)) dW(s) \rangle_{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|B(X(s))\|_{L_{HS}(L^2(\mathcal{O}), H)}^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2, \quad t \in [0, T].
\end{aligned}$$

By Hypothesis (H_2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[e^{-2\alpha t} |Y(t)|_{-1}^2] + 2e^{-2\alpha t} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (j(Y(s)) + j^*(\eta(s))) d\xi ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \frac{L^2}{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left[e^{-2\alpha t} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |X(s)|_{-1}^2 ds \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \frac{L^2}{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t e^{-2\alpha(t-s)} \mathbb{E} e^{-2\alpha s} |X(s)|_{-1}^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2} |x|_{-1}^2 + \frac{L^2 M_1^2}{4\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[e^{-2\alpha t} |Y(t)|_{-1}^2] \leq \frac{L^2 M_1^2}{2\alpha} + |x|_{-1}^2$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{Q_T} (j(Y(s)) + j^*(\eta(s))) d\xi \leq \left(\frac{L^2 M_1^2}{2\alpha} + |x|_{-1}^2 \right) e^{2\alpha T}.$$

Hence for $\alpha > L^2$, $M_1^2 > 2|x|_{-1}^2$ and $M_2 \geq M_1^2 e^{2\alpha T}$ the operator Γ maps $\mathcal{K}$ into itself. By a similar computation involving Hypothesis (H_2) we see that for M_1, M_2 and α suitably chosen

$$\|Y_1 - Y_2\|_{\alpha} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \|X_1 - X_2\|_{\alpha} \tag{4.4}$$

where $Y_i = \Gamma X_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Hence for a suitable α , Γ is a contraction and so equation $X = \Gamma(X)$ has a unique solution in Γ . This completes the proof. $\square$

References

- [1] D.G. Aronson, *The porous medium equation*, Lecture Notes Math. Vol. 1224, Springer, Berlin, 1-46, 1986.
- [2] V.Barbu, *Analysis and control of nonlinear infinite dimensional systems*, Academic Press, 1993.
- [3] V. Barbu and G. Da Prato *A phase field system perturbed by noise*, Nonlinear Analysis TMA, **51**, 1087-1099, 2002.
- [4] V. Barbu, V.I. Bogachev, G. Da Prato and M. Röckner, *Weak solution to the stochastic porous medium equations: the degenerate case*, J. Functional An, **237**, 54-75, 2006.
- [5] J. Berryman, *Stability of the solutions for fast diffusions*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **74**, 379-388, 1980
- [6] H. Brézis, *Opérateurs maximaux monotones et semigroupes de contraction dans les espaces de Hilbert*, North-Holland, 1973.
- [7] G. Da Prato, *Kolmogorov equations for stochastic PDEs*, Birkhäuser, 2004.
- [8] G. Da Prato, M. Röckner, B. L. Rozovskii and Wang Feng –Yu, *Strong Solutions of Stochastic Generalized Porous Media Equations: Existence, Uniqueness and Ergodicity*, Comm. PDEs, **31**, 277-291, 2006.
- [9] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes, **229**, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [10] N.V. Krylov and B.L. Rozovskii, *Stochastic evolution equations*, Translated from Itogi Naukii Tekhniki, Seriya Sovremennye Problemy Matematiki 14(1979), 71–146, Plenum Publishing Corp. 1981.
- [11] J. L. Lions, *Quelques méthodes de solutions de problèmes non linéaires*, Dunod, Gauthier-Villars, 1969.
- [12] G. Marinoschi, *Functional approach to nonlinear models of water flows in soils*, Springer-Verlag, 2006.

- [13] I. J. Pedron, R. S. Mendes, T. J. Buratto, L. C. Malacarne, E. K. Lenzi, *Logarithmic diffusion and porous media equations: A unified description*, Physical Review, E72, 03 1106, 2005.
- [14] C. Prevot and M. Röckner, *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*, Monograph 2006, to appear in Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer.
- [15] J. Ren, M. Röckner and Feng-Yu Wang, *Stochastic generalized porous media and fast diffusions equations*, BiBoS-preprint 2006, to appear in J. Diff. Eqn.